

Iowa Department of Human Services

Report on

Iowa's Highly Structured Juvenile Program

**Submitted to the Iowa Legislature by
Kevin W. Concannon, Director
Iowa Department of Human Services
December 14, 2007**

Iowa Department of Human Services
Report on
Iowa's Highly Structured Juvenile Program

Table of Contents

I)	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
II)	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.....	5
III)	IOWA'S HIGHLY STRUCTURED JUVENILE PROGRAMS	5
IV)	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
V)	PROCESS OF DATA ANALYSIS COMPARING THE IOWA HSJP AND GROUP CARE PROGRAMS.....	9
VI)	RESULTS OF THE DATA COMPARISON.....	10
VII)	DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES RECOMMENDATION	21
VIII)	APPENDIXES	22
	APPENDIX ONE – IOWA'S TWO HIGHLY STRUCTURED JUVENILE PROGRAMS	22
	APPENDIX TWO – SUPPLEMENTARY GRAPHICAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE DATA COMPARISON.....	27
	APPENDIX THREE -- LITERATURE REVIEW REFERENCES	30

I) Executive Summary

The Iowa Department of Human Services (DHS or Department) consulted with the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning of the Department of Human Rights to prepare this report. The Legislature requested a review of the programming and effectiveness of Iowa's two highly structured juvenile programs. This report includes information gathered two ways. First, a literature review of international research concerning juvenile "boot camp" programs was conducted. Second, recidivism and foster care re-entry rates for the Iowa highly structured juvenile program (HSJP) was compared with the recidivism and foster care re-entry rates of other Iowa group foster care programs (called Comparison or Control group in the Iowa-specific data of this report).

Study findings

The literature review revealed that no U.S. studies found statistically significant differences in recidivism between boot camp graduates and comparison groups. Research seems to indicate that simply participating in boot camps does not improve outcomes for most juveniles. Most studies found little difference in outcomes, suggesting that boot camps, as a tool, are neither better nor worse than other alternatives.

State fiscal years (SFY) 2006 and 2007 were used to study recidivism and re-entry. A group of juveniles discharged from the highly structured programs during SFY 2006 (139 individuals) was compared with a group discharged during SFY 2006 from group foster care (140 individuals). The follow up period for each group was through the end of SFY 2007.

Most categories of comparison between the two groups showed no remarkable differences. However, one distinguishing finding was the average number of days from discharge until a new adjudication. For the HSJP group the number was 253 days and for the Comparison group the number was 331 days. On average, the highly structured group recidivated 2 ½ months sooner.

The HSJP group also had more serious charges at the time of the recidivism. The HSJP group's "Violent" charges represented 37% of all their charges post-program discharge, while "Violent" charges represented 19% of the Comparison group's charges post-program discharge. Less serious "Property" offenses represented 29% of the HSJP group's charges while "Property" offenses represented 49% of the Comparison group's charges.

Drug offenses were slightly higher for the HSJP group too; they represented 15% of the charges of the HSJP and 11% of the charges of the Comparison group. The children in the highly structured group were also more likely to be placed in detention post-discharge, 41% compared to 18%.

Report recommendation

The Department recommends that state funding should not continue to be specifically designated for the highly structured program.

If the currently designated funding (\$2,373,942 for SFY 2008) became a part of the other group care allocation, the following is anticipated:

1. There would be no change in the way referrals are made to the program today. The highly structured juvenile programs would also continue to be licensed as they are today (group foster care facilities) and the juvenile courts (today's primary users) or others could make referrals to the programs as needed.
2. There would be no reduction in the total dollars available for the program.
3. Increased Federal Financial Participation (FFP) of about \$700,000, which is reflected in the DHS Council's budget to the Governor, will ease the burden on the state budget. Redefining the population served is expected to increase access to the FFP.
4. There would be added flexibility and access to services currently unavailable in this program. Redefining the population served does not preclude the focus on the structure provided today. However, HSJP residents today are not eligible for either Title IVE funding or other Medicaid-funded treatment services, including the Remedial Services Program, other Title 19 services, or medication.

If funding for this program continues to be specifically designated in the state appropriation, the following would be expected:

1. The DHS Council's budget request to the Governor for group care in SFY 2009 would need an additional \$700,000; and,
2. The Department would be compelled to comply with The Accountable Government Act and initiate a new competitive bidding process to select the provider(s) of this program. Iowa's two highly structured juvenile programs have received dedicated funding through the appropriation for about 13 years, since the first and only competitive bidding process in 1994.

II) Introduction and Background

The Iowa Department of Human Services (DHS or Department) presents this report to the Iowa Legislature in response to House File 909. House File 909 includes the Department's appropriation bill for State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2008 and stated the following in Section 18, Paragraph 4, Section c:

“[T]he department of human services, in consultation with the division of criminal and juvenile justice planning of the department of human rights, shall review the programming and effectiveness of the two existing highly structured juvenile programs. The review shall include consideration of the national research concerning juvenile "boot camp" programs, comparison of recidivism rates and foster care re-entry rates for the highly structured programs with those of other group foster care programs. The review shall provide a recommendation as to whether or not funding should continue to be specifically designated for the highly structured programs. The department shall report on or before December 15, 2007, with findings and recommendations to the persons designated by this Act to receive reports.”

The Department would like to recognize the contribution from staff at the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning in the Iowa Department of Human Rights. Their assistance with the compilation and analysis of the data for this report was greatly appreciated.

III) Iowa's Highly Structured Juvenile Programs

History of the Highly Structured Juvenile Program in Iowa

In the early 1990s, several Iowa legislators and the Department explored the possibility of creating military-style group homes for children adjudicated delinquent. Public officials believed there was a need for highly structured, short-term residential programs that modified behaviors and met rehabilitative treatment needs of teenage boys.

It was felt the programs should be more physically demanding, structured, intensive, and more time-limited than existing types of group care, but less punitive than the State Training School. Admission criteria were designed to admit delinquent boys most likely to benefit from the program.¹

A Request For Proposal (RFP) was issued in 1993 - 1994 that resulted in two agencies receiving contracts to provide these highly structured programs. The Iowa Legislature provided funding in the appropriation bill in spring 1994.

¹ The data used for this report also shows that exceptions to the admission policy are sometimes made to allow placement of a child adjudicated as a child in need of assistance (CINA).

In its first year, the HSJP was a part of the overall allocation for group care services. One year later, funding continued for the program with its own designated budget line item.

While it had been one of the four types of group care offered, since the early 1990s the Iowa legislature has provided the HSJP with its own budget identity using a designated line item in the Department's annual appropriations bill. Although the Iowa Code does not specifically refer to the HSJP, rules and regulations for the program had been set out in two chapters of the Iowa Administrative Code (IAC).

The HSJP is described in the group care licensing chapter, 441 IAC 114 (2). Other program requirements had also been set out in the rehabilitative and treatment service chapter, 441 IAC 185.83 (4), until portions of the chapter were rescinded due to changes in the Medicaid program.²

The four types of group care Iowa has historically had available were the following. Two were based on levels of licensure (the *Community* level of licensure and the more intensive *Comprehensive* level of licensure). The other two types (both of which had to also be licensed as either Community or Comprehensive) were the "Enhanced" level of group care and the HSJP, both once defined as different levels of "certification" under the Rehabilitation, Treatment and Supportive Services (RTSS) program.

When Medicaid services were de-linked from Iowa's group care program on November 1, 2006, the RTSS program had no further involvement in group care, and the certification levels of Enhanced and HSJP programs lost their relevance to group care. However, all licensure requirements remain unchanged and the "enhanced" programs and the two HSJPs continue to meet all their respective contractual agreements for the provision of these services.

General description of the Iowa Highly Structured Juvenile Program

The programs are designed for adjudicated delinquent youth from the ages of 15 to 17 years who are not able to benefit further from community-based services at the time of placement, but would be able to successfully return to the community following intensive short-term residential treatment. Due to their aggressive behavior, the youth require a high degree of supervision and a structure that stresses discipline, physical activity, education, and social skill development. Each youth has a previous adjudication of delinquency for commitment of a public offense that is a serious misdemeanor or above, but not a forcible felony. Goals of placement are to prevent further criminal activity (reduce recidivism), prevent further residential treatment, and to prevent placement at the State Training School in Eldora.

² Parts of Chapter 185 still exist but the entire Division of those rules pertaining to group care services was rescinded when Medicaid services were "de-linked" after the federal Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services informed the Department it could not use Medicaid funds to pay for treatment-related services in group care.

The program is short-term, with a length of stay of 90 days and based on a cohort system using groups of children moving through the various phases of the program together. All placements are managed by the juvenile court. Discharge planning must be started within the first 30 calendar days of placement and focus on identifying discharge placement options and follow-up service needs.

Program participants may be readmitted to the program for an additional 30, 60, or 90 days and readmissions are processed in the same manner as the original admission, using the same criteria. A readmission should be a rare occurrence, used only when troublesome behaviors, diagnoses or problems arise late in the original placement, and more time in the program will benefit the child. There are no temporary discharges from the highly structured program to detention or other placement for discipline purposes.

Care and treatment include therapy to meet the behavioral health care needs of the youth and specialized behavior management techniques that are used several times per day. Other skill development services are provided as needed and are based on the behavioral health care need of the youth. Social skill development is also a focus and youth are provided 24-hour supervision.

Each Iowa provider has a contract with a negotiated rate for maintaining children placed in a highly structured program. The unit of service for HSJP is one day and payment for this daily rate is calculated based on a 30-day month unless the Department is able to provide payment based on the actual number of days in a month; then rates are adjusted accordingly. Children in the HSJP are not eligible for federal IV-E maintenance funds because the primary purpose of their placement is “detention or incarceration of juvenile delinquents” as defined by federal regulation.

Iowa’s two HSJP programs are the following:

1. Woodward Youth Corporation, DBA “Woodward Academy” in Woodward, Iowa. The HSJP is located in one of four 24-bed group care units at Woodward Academy. The other three units are group care units licensed for Community or Comprehensive residential placement.
2. The SUMMIT Program of Family Resources, Inc., located in Davenport, Iowa. The HSJP is in one of several group care units on the Family Resources, Inc. campus. The other units are licensed for Community or Comprehensive residential placement.

Specific program information regarding Iowa’s two HSJPs is in Appendix One.

IV)Literature Review

A review of recent articles studying the effectiveness of boot camps was done in order to provide a national and international perspective on the subject. Boot camps have received considerable attention over the last two decades, and both have their proponents and detractors. Proponents suggest that the intense structure and emphasis on physical activities are beneficial to developing self-control and reducing criminal behavior. Critics cite instances of abuse by staff and the potential for increased aggression as arguments against this type of behavioral intervention.

Boots camps have been implemented as programming for a diverse set of populations. Early camps were adult-only, with juvenile boot camps coming later. Some were designed for youthful offenders, some for adults, and some for juveniles only. Others were designed as prison alternatives; shock incarceration and probation; jail alternatives; and, alternatives to other types of juvenile detention facilities. As the populations and purposes of the programs varied, comparability between study populations has been difficult.

Most boot camp designers, administrators, legislators, and evaluators do agree that one of the primary goals of boot camps is a reduction in recidivism for boot camp graduates compared to other interventions. Therefore, most studies use the rate of recidivism as one measure of effectiveness.

The literature review for this report was restricted to articles published after 1999 with study populations of juveniles. Four of the studies reviewed evaluated specific boot camp programs compared to some alternative type of intervention, three programs in the United States and one in England. One study evaluated juvenile perceptions of the boot camp experience. Another study involved a meta-analysis of 44 separate studies of boot camps.

None of the U.S. studies found statistically significant differences in recidivism between the boot camp graduates and the comparison groups. A long-term follow-up of a boot camp in California, with an intensive aftercare component, resulted in the following conclusion: "In sum, it found no significant differences between boot camp and control youth in average time to first arrest or in average overall arrest charges during the first year, during the first three years, and during all available years following release to parole" (Bottcher, et al 2005).

A study of a jail-alternative boot camp found "the likelihood of being rearrested is statistically unaffected by being sent to boot camp" (Stinchcomb, et al 2001). There were differences between demographic groups controlling for other characteristics. Age and race were better predictors of recidivism than boot camp, jail release, probation, or prior felonies.

An evaluation of a program in a northwestern state found that boot camp placements did not reduce re-offenses for juveniles, but did not aggravate recidivism either (Steiner, et al

2007). A study comparing two programs in England found that outcomes were improved in one site but not the other (Farrington, et al 2002). The author hypothesized that the difference was due to program components other than the militaristic and physical training.

The meta-analysis done by MacKenzie and others found “almost equal odds of recidivating between the boot camp and comparison groups, on average. Thus there appears to be no relationship between program participation (boot camp or comparison) and recidivism” (MacKenzie, 2001).

Therefore, research seems to indicate that simply participating in boot camps does not improve outcomes for most juveniles. Most studies found little difference in outcomes, suggesting that boot camps, as a tool, are neither better nor worse than other alternatives. There are suggestions that other treatment or rehabilitative components may improve the possibility of reduced recidivism, though these have not been as thoroughly researched in terms of also examining the location of the service provision.

References to the literature reviewed are in Appendix Three.

V) Process of Data Analysis Comparing the Iowa HSJP and Group Care Programs

Data from the target group (the HSJP) was compared with the data of a Comparison/Control group (from group foster care) by the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning of the Department of Human Rights. The Iowa Department of Human Services provided case record information.

The target group consisted of youth discharged from a HSJP during SFY 2006 (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006). The follow-up period ran from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007. This represents a maximum follow-up period of two years and a minimum of one year. One hundred thirty-nine (139) youth were identified in the target group.

The Comparison (or Control) group was selected from a group of youth discharged from Community or Comprehensive levels of group care during SFY 2006. Youth matching certain characteristics of the target group were selected. A random select option in SPSS was used to select the number of cases needed (140) from the pool of available cases. The Comparison group was followed for the same time period as the youth of the HSJP.

The Department of Human Services case records were matched and linked to the juvenile records contained in the Justice Data Warehouse (JDW). Data are from the Iowa Court Information System (ICIS) of Juvenile Court Services.

The following characteristics of the two groups were compared:

1. Race
2. Age
3. Previous juvenile adjudications
4. Previous DHS service history
5. Post-discharge recidivism
6. Post-discharge DHS service history

VI) Results of the Data Comparison

The HSJP group

During SFY 2006, 139 youth exited HSJP placement (55 youth exited the Woodward Academy and 84 youth exited the Summit program). Of these, 18 youth (12.9%) were not adjudicated delinquent prior to their placement in the HSJP. All youth in this group were male and all data were acquired from DHS unless otherwise noted.

The Comparison group

A Comparison group was selected from the 1,507 records of youth discharged from group care during SFY 2006. Like the HSJP group, all youth in this group were male and all data were acquired from DHS unless otherwise noted.

To ensure a cohort similar to the HSJP group, the following criteria were used to select the Comparison group:

1. N (number) = 140 (this sample size was selected because of 139 in the HSJP group)
2. Age ≥ 14 years and < 18 years
3. Level of care = Community or Comprehensive group care
4. Adjudicated delinquent (6 youth were adjudicated post-placement, 4.2%)
5. History of placements in DHS services ≥ 1 and < 4

Demographics of the two groups

In addition to the following tables, there are graphs in Appendix Two that provide a different, supplementary view of selected data.

Race

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Caucasian	97	69.8%	105	75.0%
African American	30	21.6%	23	16.4%
Hispanic	7	5.0%	7	5.0%
Native American	1	0.7%	1	0.7%
Asian/Pac Islander	2	1.4%	2	1.4%
Other	2	1.4%	2	1.4%
Total	139	100.0%	140	100.0%

Age (at start date of placement)

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
13	3	2.2%	1	0.7%
14	13	9.4%	27	19.3%
15	40	28.8%	39	27.9%
16	45	32.4%	49	35.0%
17*	38	27.3%	24	17.1%
Total	139	100.0%	140	100.0%

*One youth in the HSJP turned 18 the day of placement

The average age of the HSJP group was 16.3 years.

The average age of the Comparison group was 16.0 years.

The following table describes the locations children went when discharged from the programs during SFY 2006.

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Returned Home	107	77.0%	116	82.9%
Placed w/Suitable Person	3	2.2%	3	2.1%
Aged Out	4	2.9%	5	3.6%
Change in Placement	8	5.8%	8	5.7%
Change in Level of Care	14	10.1%	2	1.4%
Runaway	3	2.2%	6	4.3%
Total	139	100.0%	140	100.0%

The following table describes the length of stay children spent in placement prior to discharge from the programs during SFY 2006.

Length of stay (in days)

	HSJP	Comparison
Minimum	6	6
Maximum	150 ³	805
Average	92.8	266.2

Previous juvenile adjudications (original charge)

The following tables include the most recent adjudicated charge(s) prior to the youth's placement in the HSJP or the Comparison group.

Considering the 18 youth that were not adjudicated prior to their placement in the HSJP results in 121 youth with 209 adjudicated charges, or an average of 1.7 charges per youth.

There were six youth that were not adjudicated until after their group care placement. Of the 134 remaining youth in the Comparison group, there were 216 adjudicated charges, or an average of 1.6 charges per youth.

Allegations – Charge Class

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Felony		29.7%		31.5%
Felony B	1	0.5%	5	2.3%
Felony C	14	6.7%	14	6.5%
Felony D	47	22.5%	49	22.7%
Misdemeanor		67.5%		66.7%
Aggravated	48	23.0%	44	20.3%
Serious	42	20.1%	26	12.0%
Simple	51	24.4%	74	34.3%
Other Charges (Scheduled/Unknown)	6	2.9%	4	1.9%
Total	209	100.0%	216	100.0%

³ Although the HSJP are designed as 90-day programs, occasionally a child is readmitted for a 30, 60, or 90-day cycle.

Allegations – Charge Subtype

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Violent	39	18.7%	42	19.4%
Property	115	55.0%	116	53.7%
Public Order	36	17.2%	37	17.1%
Drug	19	9.1 %	20	9.3%
Other	0	0.0%	1	0.5%
Total	209	100.0%	216	100.0%

Previous DHS service history⁴**Services delivered prior to discharge**

The following table includes all services delivered or started before the youth exited HSJP or the Comparison group during state fiscal 2006.

There were 736 services delivered to the 139 youth prior to their HSJP discharge.

There were 764 services delivered to the 140 youth prior to their Comparison group discharge.

Service History – Prior to Discharge

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Family Centered	154	20.9%	201	26.3%
Foster Care	316	42.9%	369	48.3%
Family Preservation	3	0.4%	9	1.2%
*Other Placements	263	35.7%	185	24.2%
Total	736	100.0%	764	100.0%

⁴ The all-inclusive DHS service delivery period for the service related data of this study was January 1993 through August 2007. Portions of that time period were used dependent on the services being studied, either pre or post discharge.

*Other placements in the above table include:

Other Placements	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Detention	136	51.7%	99	53.5%
Hospital	2	0.8%	1	0.5%
Relative	7	2.7%	2	1.1%
Runaway	13	4.9%	1	0.5%
State Training School	1	0.4%	10	5.4%
Trial Home Visit	104	39.5%	72	38.9%
Total	263	100.0%	185	100.0%

The following table includes data regarding the distance between a youth's primary residence and the location of the HSJP or the Comparison group placement.

Distance in Miles from Residence to Placement				
	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
≤50	46	33.1%	30	21.4%
51-100	33	23.7%	49	35.0%
101-200	56	40.3%	43	30.7%
201-300	4	2.9%	12	8.6%
>300	0	0.0%	6	4.3%
Total	139	100.0%	140	100.0%

Foster Care Re-Entry

Services delivered post-discharge

The following table includes services delivered to youth after they exited the HSJP or the Comparison group during SFY 2006.

There were 132 youth (94.9%) that received services after their exit from HSJP.

There were 135 youth (96.4%) that received services after their exit from the Comparison

group. The service history provided by DHS included services through August 30, 2007.

Service History – Post-Discharge

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Family Centered	22	7.2%	34	12.8%
Foster Care	57	18.7%	34	12.8%
Family Preservation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
*Other Placements	226	74.1%	198	74.4%
Total	305	100.0%	266	100.0%

*Other Placements in the above table include:

Other Placements	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Detention	41	18.1%	18	9.1%
Hospital	1	0.4%	1	0.5%
Non Child Welfare Facility	1	0.4%	0	0.0%
Relative	6	2.7%	4	2.0%
Runaway	10	4.4%	8	4.0%
State Training School	17	7.5%	13	6.6%
Trial Home Visit	150	66.4%	154	77.8%
Total	226	100.0%	198	100.0%

Recidivists

For the purposes of this study, recidivism was defined as any: 1) new adjudicated charge; 2) waiver to adult court that resulted in a conviction; or, 3) adult conviction that occurred between the date of discharge from the HSJP or the Comparison group and June 30, 2007. Recidivism data were acquired from the Iowa Justice Data Warehouse and Iowa Courts On-Line. While the overall recidivism rates of the two groups were similar, the HSJP group was more likely to recidivate sooner after discharge than the Comparison group.

	HSJP		Comparison	
Number of Recidivists:	54		57	
Recidivism Rate	38.8%		40.7%	
Avg. # Days Until New Charge	252.5		330.5	
# Convicted Within 12 months	38		35	
Status of Recidivists				
Adjudications	32	59.2%	22	38.6%
Waivers	7	13.0%	17	29.8%
Adult Convictions	15	27.8%	18	31.6%

The following tables include demographic information on those youth with new convictions/adjudications between date of discharge and June 30, 2007.

Demographics – Recidivists

Race of Recidivists

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Caucasian	38	70.4%	42	73.7%
African American	15	27.8%	11	19.3%
Hispanic	1	1.9%	4	7.0%
Total	54	100.0%	57	100.0%

Recidivists compared to Original Cohorts, By Race

	HSJP			Comparison		
	All	Recid	% Recid	All	Recid	% Recid
Caucasian	97	38	39.2%	105	42	40.0%
African American	30	15	50.0%	23	11	47.8%
Hispanic	7	1	14.3%	7	4	57.1%

Age (At adjudication or conviction)

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
15	11	20.4%	5	8.8%
16	12	22.2%	11	19.3%
17	15	27.8%	22	38.6%
18	13	24.1%	14	24.6%
19	3	5.6%	5	8.8%
Total	54	100.0%	57	100.0%

The average age of the HSJP Recidivists was 17.2 years.

The average age of the Comparison Group Recidivists was 17.6 years.

Recidivists Compared to Original Cohort, By Age

Age (At Start Date of Service)

	Boot Camp			Comparison		
	All	Recid	%	All	Recid	%
13	3	1	33.3%	1	0	0.0%
14	13	7	53.8%	27	14	51.9%
15	40	14	35.0%	39	13	33.3%
16	45	17	37.8%	49	22	44.9%
17	38	15	39.5%	24	8	33.3%
Total	139	54	38.8%	140	57	40.7%

Allegations/Charges – Recidivism

The tables below contain data regarding the most serious charge for which the youth was adjudicated/convicted between the date of discharge from HSJP or the Comparison group placement and June 30, 2007. While the overall recidivism rates of the two groups were similar, the HSJP group was more likely to have a new violent allegation; the Comparison group members were more likely to be charged with property offenses.

Allegations – Charge Class

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Felony		24.1%		21.1%
Felony B	1	1.9%	0	0.0%
Felony C	2	3.7%	1	1.8%
Felony D	10	18.5%	11	19.3%
Misdemeanor		75.9%		78.9%
Aggravated	10	18.5%	10	17.5%
Serious	9	16.7%	15	26.3%
Simple	22	40.7%	20	35.1%
Total	54	100.0%	57	100.0%

Allegations – Charge Subtype

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Violent	20	37.0%	11	19.3%
Property	15	27.8%	28	49.1%
Public Order	11	20.4%	11	19.3%
Drug	8	14.8%	6	10.5%
Other	0	0.0%	1	1.8%
Total	54	100.0%	57	100.0%

Service History of Recidivists

All youth that recidivated received services prior to their HSJP or the Comparison group placement. The following table shows the services they received before placement.

Service History - Before Placement

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Family Centered	72	25.0%	98	26.2%
Foster Care	129	44.8%	170	45.5%
Family Preservation	2	0.7%	8	2.1%
Other Placements	85	29.5%	98	26.2%
Total	288	100.0%	374	100.0%

Of the 54 youth discharged from the HSJP, 96.3% received services after discharge.

Of the 57 youth discharged from the Comparison group, 94.7% received services after discharge. The following table shows a breakdown of the services they received.

Service History - After Discharge

	HSJP		Comparison	
	N	%	N	%
Family Centered	9	6.5%	21	15.6%
Foster Care	24	17.3%	16	11.9%
Family Preservation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other Placements	106	76.3%	98	72.6%
Total	139	100.0%	135	100.0%

The last two tables that follow provide a side-by-side summary of the information compared between the two groups in this study.

Table 1 represents all the children in the study. Table 2 represents the children that recidivated.

Table 1

ALL YOUTH IN STUDY	HSJP	Comparison Group
	N=139	N=140
Mean Age	16.3 years	16.0 years
% Minority	30.2%	25.0%
Original Charges:		
Charge Class: % Felony	29.7%	31.5%
% Misdemeanor	67.5%	66.7%
Charge Type: Violent	18.7%	19.4%
Property	55.0%	53.7%
Public Order	17.2%	17.1%
Drug	9.1%	9.3%
% Receiving Previous Services	100.0%	100.0%
Foster Care	42.9%	48.3%
Family Centered	20.9%	26.3%
Other Placements	35.7%	24.2%
% Receiving Post Services	94.9%	96.4%
Foster Care	18.7%	12.8%
Family Centered	7.2 %	12.8%
Other Placements	74.1%	74.4%

Table 2

RECIDIVISTS	HSJP	Comparison Group
	N=54	N=57
Mean Age	17.2 years	17.6 years
% Minority	29.6%	26.3%
Recidivism Rate	38.8%	40.7%
Average # Days Until New Charge	252.5 days	330.5 days
Charge Class: % Felony	24.1%	21.1%
% Misdemeanor	75.9%	78.9%
Charge Type: Violent	37.0%	19.3%
Property	27.8%	49.1%
Public Order	20.4%	19.3%
Drug	14.8%	10.5%
% Receiving Previous Services	100.0%	100.0%
Foster Care	44.8%	45.5%
Family Centered	25.0%	26.2%
Other Placements	29.5%	26.2%
% Receiving Post Services	96.3%	94.7%
Foster Care	17.3%	11.9%
Family Centered	6.5%	15.6%
Other Placements	76.3%	72.6%

VII) Department of Human Services Recommendation

The Department recommends that funding should not continue to be specifically designated for the highly structured program.

Appropriations language that currently designates funding for these programs also allows any of the funding not used for the highly structured juvenile program to be used for group care. If the currently designated funding (\$2,373,942 for SFY 2008) became a part of the group care allocation, the following is anticipated:

1. There would be no change in the way referrals are made to the program today. The highly structured juvenile programs would also continue to be licensed as they are today (group foster care facilities) and the juvenile courts (today's primary users) or others could make referrals to the programs as needed.
2. There would be no reduction in the total dollars available for the program.
3. Increased Federal Financial Participation (FFP) of about \$700,000, which is reflected in the DHS Council's budget to the Governor, will ease the burden on the state budget. Redefining the population served is expected to increase access to the FFP.
4. There would be added flexibility and access to services currently unavailable in this program. Redefining the population served does not preclude the focus on the structure provided today. However, HSJP residents today are not eligible for either Title IVE funding or other Medicaid-funded treatment services, including the Remedial Services Program, other Title 19 services, or medication.

If funding for this program continues to be specifically designated in the appropriations, the following would be expected:

1. The DHS Council's budget request to the Governor for group care in SFY 2009 would need an additional \$700,000; and,
2. The Department would be compelled to comply with The Accountable Government Act and initiate a new competitive bidding process to select the provider(s) of this program. Iowa's two highly structured juvenile programs have received dedicated funding through the appropriation for about 13 years, since the first and only competitive bidding process in 1994.

VIII) Appendixes

Appendix One – Iowa’s two Highly Structured Juvenile Programs

Iowa’s two Highly Structured Juvenile Programs are both 90-day programs with many common program components. Both programs are designed to serve adolescent males per the criteria related to the HSJP as described in Section III. of this report.

When asked to contribute descriptions of their respective programs, each program stressed they did not view their programs as “stereotypical” or that they “differ significantly from the traditional ‘boot camp’ philosophies receiving so much national attention at this time.”

Following is the information they each provided to the Department.

1. Woodward Academy

Woodward Academy’s program focuses on the total scope relative to the student being placed. It does not share some of the same characteristics of other national programs related to such things as physical consequences, constant marching, cadencing, wilderness survival and military focus.

The following formal and informal program aspects are believed to separate this program from others around the country.

Year around schooling

There is an on-campus school accredited by the State of Iowa and Nationally by NCA (North Central Accreditation). All students take the MAT test upon admission for appropriate grade level placement. All credits transfer back to their home school district upon graduation. Also offered is GED programming through Des Moines Area Community College. Appropriate students also are involved in college level courses on-line.

Cognitive restructuring phase packets

The four phases are: I. Taking responsibility for your actions; II Victim empathy; III. Building healthy relationships; and, IV. Relapse prevention. Each student is assigned a primary counselor that works directly with them on these four areas. Completion of this packet work is a requirement for graduation.

Individual/Family Counseling

Each student has the opportunity to work individually and to receive family counseling while at Woodward Academy.

ART (Aggression Replacement Therapy)

Each student receives 9 weeks of the ART program.

Vocations

Students receive training, education, and receive age-appropriate job skills. They also have the opportunity to hold paying jobs on-campus such as woodworking, dietary food services, maintenance, moving /storage business, carpentry, and lawn care. These students are also assisted upon discharge with job placement in their home areas.

Life Skills Electives

Students are involved in 9-week life skill classes that range from home economics, sex education, financial planning, preparing to enter the workforce, and parenting/child development classes.

Substance Abuse

Woodward Academy has a licensed substance abuse program and substance director on-campus. Students with substance abuse related charges, issues, history, etc., all complete this program.

Athletics

Woodward Academy is a member of the Iowa High School Athletic Association and participates with surrounding schools in athletics programs including varsity track and field, cross country, and basketball. Woodward Academy also has a nationally recognized power lifting team. All students have the opportunity to compete athletically while in residence.

Lifetime commitment/Alumni program

Upon leaving Woodward Academy, all students become part of our nationwide networking lifetime commitment program. It is available to our students for the rest of their lives and offers them scholarship opportunities, job placement, financial assistance if appropriate, and an ongoing connection with the Woodward Academy family.

All of the above programming components are equally important to the success of our students. A strong, Normative culture allows the Woodward Academy program to offer our students many opportunities that truly lead to success.

Woodward Academy disagrees with many of the beliefs, philosophies, etc., of the clinical/custodial models often seen in this field. Woodward Academy also believes that “boot camps,” in theory, are not effective and do very little in preparing youth for success when they return home. This is why outside of a uniform, minimal military components such as cadencing, and some jargon (all pride factors), students in the highly structured program are part of the Normative culture on our campus.

Woodward Academy is very aware of the criminogenic and non-criminogenic factors that are believed to be the new cutting edge in juvenile delinquency treatment and its philosophy and focus have long been on the “realistic” factors that contribute and lead to a student’s success after discharge, not solely on the clinical factors so often given students to justify their delinquent behaviors and thinking. Also, continued efforts to treat delinquency as a mental health issue is another step back for our field. It will continue to drive programs to focus on areas that are not in the best interest of our youth and do very little to help them succeed in the community.

2. SUMMIT (a program of Family Resources, Inc.)

“SUMMIT” is an acronym for Success Using Motivation, Morale, Intensity and Treatment. The SUMMIT methodology is divided into the following five components of treatment: Therapy; Education; Community Service; Physical Training; and, Military Model.

SUMMIT Program personnel include a program supervisor, assistant program supervisor, team leaders, caseworker, and a host of instructors who work directly with residents within the SUMMIT program. Each child and his family are assigned a caseworker at the time of intake that follows the child and the family through all services provided by Family Resources, Inc.

A youth's family is an integral part of treatment and healthy family relationships enhance a young person's sense of support. Staff encourages family involvement by engaging families in the treatment process.

The Five Components of Treatment

i. Therapy

Group and Individual Therapy

Residents attend a variety of groups while at SUMMIT. Qualified staff provides a minimum of 1 hr. of group therapy to each resident each week.

Individual therapy is provided to residents when specific needs are identified. These services can be provided both on or off campus depending on the level of expertise needed to address the individualized needs of each resident.

Substance Abuse

Family Resources, Inc. partners with two providers of adolescent substance abuse services, The Center for Alcohol and Drug Services (CADS) and New Choices. The Center for Alcohol and Drugs Services provides residents with a weekly group session to focus on issues of substance abuse and education. Additional substance abuse services are provided as needed by either CADS or New Choices.

Skill Development

Residents attend a daily skills group session. Skills covered range from anger management, communication, social skills, and vocational/independent living skills groups. Skill development instruction and practice occurs throughout the day as instructors engage in active teaching of specific skills necessary for the child to learn.

ii. Education

Residents of the SUMMIT program attend school on-campus at the Wittenmeyer Learning Center (WLC.) The WLC is a partnership between Family Resources, Inc., Inc. and the Davenport Community School District to provide educational services. Residents who satisfy the requirements of the classes for a semester earn Davenport Community School District credit. Education services are provided year around for SUMMIT residents.

For students pursuing their General Equivalency Degree, Family Resources, Inc. partners with Scott Community College's Career Assistance Center.

iii. Community Service

The SUMMIT Program has a partnership with the communities of the Quad Cities and SUMMIT residents are able to participate in a variety of community service projects designed to not only give back to the community, but also to expose residents to opportunities to serve that exist in their home communities. Community service projects expose residents to a variety of vocational interests and hobbies and, on average, residents of SUMMIT complete 80 hours of community service prior to discharge.

iv. Physical Training

Residents start each day with physical training activities. Rigorous calisthenics, cardiovascular activities, organized team sports, and weight training that serve as a basis to provide each resident with the opportunity to improve his physical and mental capabilities. Residents report upon discharge that this activity is one of the most enjoyed.

v. Military Model

The Military Model promotes self-discipline and mutual respect. This component focuses on attention to detail, teamwork, self-control, and one's bearing.

Milieu Management

The SUMMIT Program holds each resident to a high level of expectation. Residents are expected to speak and act in a respectful manner to his peers, staff, and guests at all times. A basic expectation is to not give up or say, "I can't" when faced with a challenge.

The SUMMIT Program is a praise-dominated and motivating environment. Staff recognizes accomplishment and things done well with verbal praise. Residents are also encouraged to recognize positive behavior in each other and to celebrate their individual and group accomplishments.

Residents may also earn Merit Dollars/Positive Points for demonstrating positive behaviors. Merit Dollars accumulate in a resident's "bank" and may be "spent" on additional privileges or at the program "store."

Privilege Access Time (PAT) is generally held in the evening after all daily scheduled requirements are satisfied. During PAT, residents write and read mail, make phone calls, interact with one another more freely, and otherwise relax as the day comes to a close. PAT activities are geared toward enhancing and educating residents for a successful return to their community.

Typical daily schedule

6:10 AM	Wake Up
6:30 AM	Physical Training
8:00 AM	Morning Routine: hygiene, breakfast, and chores
9:00 AM	School
Noon	Lunch
1:00 PM	School
4:00 PM	Therapy Group
5:30 PM	Dinner
6:00 PM	Community Service/ Class/ Youth Group/ Journaling/ News/Misc. Treatment Activities and Projects
8:00 PM	Privilege Access Time/Hygiene Tasks
9:00 PM	Bed

On non-school days, the typical schedule involves more community service activities and individual and group activities designed to practice positive social skills.

The SUMMIT program promotes a positive peer culture within the treatment structure to provide opportunity for residents to practice leadership skills and team building. Residents are expected to hold themselves and their peers accountable to program expectations and societal norms.


The SUMMIT Program is based on a concept of participatory leadership. Program staffs are active participants in all treatment components to provide residents with a visual role model.

The SUMMIT caseworker or program supervisor gathers information regarding the referral and completes the initial assessment. Ongoing assessment occurs throughout the residents stay during monthly clinical case reviews with the clinical supervisor of SUMMIT.


Appendix Two – Supplementary graphical information related to the data comparison

The following selected graphs are included to provide a different view of the data presented in *Section VI, Results of the Data Comparison*. In the following, “Boot Camp” means the HSJP and “Control” means the Comparison (group care) group.


Race




Age (at start date of placement)




Locations children went when discharged during SFY 2006




Previous juvenile adjudications (original charges)




Recidivists' charges



Previous DHS service history (prior to discharge)



DHS services delivered post-discharge (foster care re-entry)



Appendix Three -- Literature Review References

1. Bottcher, Jean; Ezell, Michael E. "Examining the Effectiveness of Boot Camps: A Randomized Experiment with a Long-Term Follow Up": *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 42, No. 3, 309-332 (2005).
2. Farrington, David P.; Ditchfield, John, et al "Evaluation of two intensive regimes for young offenders:" Home Office Research Study 239, London, England, April 2002.
3. MacKenzie, Doris Layton; Wilson, David B.; Kider, Suzanne B. "Effects of Correctional Boot Camps on Offending": *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 578, No. 1, 126-143 (2001).
4. Steiner, Benjamin; Giacomazzi, Andrew L. "Juvenile Waiver, Boot Camp, and Recidivism in a Northwestern State": *The Prison Journal*, Vol. 87, No. 2, 227-240 (2007).
5. Stinchcomb, Jeanne B., Terry, W. Clinton III "Predicting the Likelihood of Rearrest Among Shock Incarceration Graduates: Moving Beyond Another Nail in the Boot Camp Coffin": *Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 47, No.2, 221-242 (2001).
6. Styve, Gaylene J., MacKenzie, Doris Layton, et al "Perceived Conditions of Confinement: A National Evaluation of Juvenile Boot Camps and Traditional Facilities": *Law and Human Behavior*, Vol. 42, No. 3, 309-332 (2005).